

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 27, 2005 in which claims 1-8 and 9-16 were subject to a Restriction Requirement, claims 1-8 were objected to along with the drawings, but claims 1-8 were indicated as otherwise being in allowable form.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indicated allowability of the subject matter recited in the claims 1-8 and respectfully request reconsideration of the remaining objections in view of the above-amendments and the following remarks.

I. RESTRICTION

Claims 1-16 were subject to a Restriction Requirement. Applicants hereby confirm the provisional election to prosecute the invention recited in claims 1-8, which is drawn to an apparatus.

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATION

The drawings and specification were objected to because certain elements were labeled differently in the specification than in the drawings. The above-amendments are believed to synchronize the use of terms between the specification and the drawings. For example, the specification is amended on page 15, line 13 to replace "read decoder 62" with --return decoder 62-- to be more consistent with the terminology used on page 15, line 5 and that appearing in FIG. 2.

Further, the Office Action suggested that the "return command register", "staging register", and "control device" must be shown in the drawings or cancelled from the claims. The return command register corresponds to the command queue (FIFO) 56 shown in FIG. 2. The specification is amended on page 14, line 14 to clarify that the master ID is returned to --a return register in the form of a command queue FIFO 56--. This Amendment is believed to synchronize the terms used in the

specification, the claims and FIG. 2. The preamble of claim 1 provides support for this Amendment, for example.

With respect to the staging register, staging register 58 is shown in FIG. 2.

With respect to the control device recited in claims 1-8, the specification is amended on page 15, line 5 to clarify that the return decoder 62 --is a control device, which-- is responsive to the master ID in register 58 and to a HMASTER code on line 26 from arbiter 14 to indicate a match. Support for this Amendment can be found with a comparison between the functions of the return decoder 62 described in the specification, the corresponding element 62 in FIG. 2 and the functions and structure of the control device recited in claims 1-8. This Amendment is believed to synchronize the terminology used in the specification, claims and figures.

The disclosure was also objected to because the specification recites "the last beat of data" on page 3, line 3. The Office Action suggested that the Applicant may have meant "the last bit of data". This clause is correct as originally filed. The term "beat" is a common term, which relates to successive transfers of data corresponding to the same transaction. For example, see page 18, lines 1-4.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestions regarding terminology and believed the above-amendments are sufficient to clarify the terminology.

With the above-amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to the specification and the drawings be withdrawn.

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-8 were objected to because of the terms "return command register" and "control device." The Office Action suggests the Applicant may have meant command queue and return decode, respectively, as illustrated in FIG. 2. As

discussed above, the above-amendments are believed to synchronize the specification, drawings and claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 1-8 be withdrawn.

If the Examiner has any remaining questions regarding terminology or suggested changes, Applicants' Attorney invites the Examiner to a telephone interview to discuss any final changes to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: David D. Brush
David D. Brush, Reg. No. 34,557
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DDB:tkj